

25X1A9a

Chief, M/FP ATTN: [REDACTED]
THRU : Chief, D/GG
Chief, GG/E

24 July 1959
CIA/RR G/S 59-15

Review of NIS 19, Section 62

25X1A9a 25X1A9a

The manuscript of Section 62, NIS 19, was reviewed by [REDACTED] as requested. The manuscript was very well written and no major questions arose concerning it. Minor points raised, related primarily to geographic locations, have been discussed with [REDACTED], and GG/E comments concerning these points are forwarded only for the record.

1. (page BB-6, line 12) The location of the Danube Iron Works should be indicated the first time the installation is referred to.

2. (page B-1, lines 1 and 2) This sentence is a little confusing since not all of the deposits are located in the north, nor are they particularly concentrated within any part of the north. The following substitution is suggested: "Most Hungarian coal deposits are located in the north, although the only hard coal deposits...."

3. (page B-20, lines 7 and 19) It is suggested that the Rakospalota Plant be named when the plant is first mentioned (line 7) rather than later (line 19) in order that it not appear that an additional plant is being introduced.

4. (page B-14, table) a) It would be useful if the geographic coordinates were listed for the peat deposits since the deposits are not shown on the map.
b) Sárrét, Mádaslady should be hyphenated to indicate a general area.
c) Szigliget, Tapolca should also be hyphenated.
d) Change Kaposvölgy to Kapos Valley.

5. (figure 62-B-3) Three deposits are designated as "location unknown". Geographic coordinates were found for two of these: Karácsnyolvapuszta (48°07'N, 20°15'E) and Lyuko (48°08'N, 20°42'E).

6. (page C-1) The question of the actual location of the Budafa Oil Field arose. Since it is not located near the town of Budafa, but, rather, in the Lispe Dome of the Budafa anticline near the town of Lispezsentaderján, it is recommended that a) the location be given as "near Lispezsentaderján", and b) that all references to Budafa be given as Budafa Field so as to avoid confusion with the town of Budafa.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Review of NIS 19, Section 62

7. In several instances reference is made to South Zala County as a proper name. References to "the southern part of Zala County (Magye)" would be preferable. (page C-1, line 11; page C-33, line 12; and C-51, line 10)

8. (page C-5, line 16) Since Pisztafoldar is not a populated place its location should be given.

9. (page C-11, line 10) Lowest depth could be interpreted as being the deepest. Suggest using "when average depth of hole was least".

10. (page C-26, line 12) Indicate that the refinery on Csepel Island is within the city limits of Budapest.

11. (page C-33, line 2) Mahót and Pusztaszentlászló are separate locations. Hyphenate the names to indicate the Mahót-Pusztaszentlászló area.

12. (page C-45, line 9) Budafok is part of Budapest.

13. (page C-47, line 7) Lower Pannonian, Strata should either read Lower Pannonian strata or Lower Pannonian.

14. (page C-71, fig. 62-e-13) The first two column headings are a little misleading. It is suggested that the first column heading be "location" and the second be "name".

25X1A9a



Distribution:

Orig. and 1 - Addressee

1 - Ch/G

1 - D/GG

2 - GG/E

25X1A9a

RR/GG/E  :ec (24 July 1959)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~